

# IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY

## Digital Repository

---

Retrospective Theses and Dissertations

Iowa State University Capstones, Theses and  
Dissertations

---

1989

## Selecting criteria for the evaluation of secondary school assistant principals based upon item discrimination power

Richard Ray Edwards  
*Iowa State University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd>

 Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Edwards, Richard Ray, "Selecting criteria for the evaluation of secondary school assistant principals based upon item discrimination power " (1989). *Retrospective Theses and Dissertations*. 8931.  
<https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd/8931>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Iowa State University Capstones, Theses and Dissertations at Iowa State University Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Retrospective Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Iowa State University Digital Repository. For more information, please contact [digirep@iastate.edu](mailto:digirep@iastate.edu).

## INFORMATION TO USERS

The most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book. These are also available as one exposure on a standard 35mm slide or as a 17" x 23" black and white photographic print for an additional charge.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

# U·M·I

University Microfilms International  
A Bell & Howell Information Company  
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA  
313/761-4700 800/521-0600



**Order Number 8920128**

**Selecting criteria for the evaluation of secondary school assistant  
principals based upon item discrimination power**

**Edwards, Richard Ray, Ph.D.**

**Iowa State University, 1989**

**U·M·I**  
300 N. Zeeb Rd.  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106



Selecting criteria for the evaluation of secondary school  
assistant principals based upon item discrimination power

by

Richard Ray Edwards

A Dissertation Submitted to the  
Graduate Faculty in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree of  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department: Professional Studies in Education  
Major: Education (Educational Administration)

Approved:

Signature was redacted for privacy.

In Charge of Major Work

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Major Department

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Graduate College

Iowa State University  
Ames, Iowa

1989

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION	1
Related Research	1
Statement of the Problem	2
Purposes of the Study	5
Assumptions	6
Delimitations	7
CHAPTER II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	8
Evaluation of Assistant Principals	8
Selection of Items with Discrimination Power	15
Summary	18
CHAPTER III. METHODS	19
Questionnaire Construction	19
Selection of the Sample and Collection of the Data	20
Treatment of Data	23
CHAPTER IV. FINDINGS	26
Introduction	26
Item Discrimination Questionnaire	27
CHAPTER V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS, DISCUSSION, RECOMMENDATIONS	46
Summary	46
Conclusions	51
Limitations	52
Discussion	54

	<u>Page</u>
Recommendations for Practice	55
Recommendations for Further Research	56
BIBLIOGRAPHY	59
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	69
APPENDIX	70



## LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
Table 1. Districts and employment position of raters who participated	21
Table 2a. Analysis of variance for two groups with 15 subjects per group	24
Table 2b. Item discrimination values in percent (analysis based on 805 subjects in 46 groups)	28
Table 3. One-way analysis of variance, means, standard deviations, and Duncan multiple comparisons between rater positions based on responses to discriminating items in rank order by F-ratio	34
Table 4. Homogeneous subsets of rater positions	42

## CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

## Related Research

The "accountability in education" trend and site-based school improvements have emphasized the need for improved administrator performance evaluation systems. In 1984, the Educational Research Service surveyed all school systems with 10,000 or more students and found that 85.9 percent of those districts had formal evaluation procedures for their administrators. This is a significant increase over results of similar surveys conducted by the Educational Research Service in 1971 when 54.5 percent of districts reported having formal administrative evaluation procedures and in 1968 when only 39.5 percent of districts surveyed reported having formal administrative evaluation procedures.

In response to these trends, rating systems were first developed for superintendents and principals, overlooking the administrator who often has the most direct contact with the staff and students within a building. The assistant principal is an often-overlooked but key member of the administrative team. A case could be built to support the idea that the building principal's success is merely a manifestation of the assistant principals who work under his/her supervision.

The purpose of this study is to develop a pool of evaluative items that discriminate between more effective and less effective assistant principal behavior. In 1983, Look (58) developed a pool of principal evaluative items based upon job situation and item discrimination power. The methodology employed by Look will be used to identify discriminating items for use in assistant principal performance evaluation.

### Building leadership

Why focus on assistant principals? Perhaps the best reason is the unique nature of the job. "All educational leaders, but particularly the assistant principal, serving in that unique position which often bridges the gap between management and faculty, may be the most effective educational leader to spearhead a rededication to positive action" (17). Bates and Schank (6) assert that "the associate principal shares the same mix of responsibilities as the principal, assuming an equivalent portion of discipline problems, staff evaluation, and supervision of curricular area."

Mitchell (72) makes the generalization that "assistant principals, like principals, serve in many capacities." "The school itself should recognize the valuable contributions of the assistant principal," asserts Iannacone and Podorf (46). Often what the assistant principal does is a function of what the principal dislikes doing.

### Statement of the Problem

Public demands for accountability in education have resulted in an increased emphasis on performance evaluation. Because the assistant principal is often the person who attends to the details of programs of implementation, his/her competencies are vital to the program's success or failure. Furthermore, the assistant principalship is a training ground for almost all subsequent promotions. These reasons make assistant principal evaluation very important.

Evaluation can be conducted for many purposes:

1. To establish a basis for change of individual behavior such that both personal satisfaction and organizational effectiveness are improved.
2. To collect factual information about performance in relation to specified objectives.
3. To assist in making decisions about compensation, promotion, transfer, or dismissal.

Valid performance items for administrators can be developed. A thorough review of the literature reveals numerous lists of competencies, skills, and behaviors used to rate administrator effectiveness. The Look (58) research further refined this list of competencies, skills, and behaviors and developed a list of items that were useful in discriminating between effective and ineffective building administrator behaviors. However, a catalog of principal behaviors found in the literature is not differentiated by elementary and secondary level and in most cases does not differentiate between assistant principal or building principal.

Evaluation is a complex process that is not exact. To minimize rater bias, as many people as possible should be involved in the evaluation process. In this way the collective judgment of the group can help to offset personal bias. Weber (110) asserts that "research data offer a good deal of information about who is best able to evaluate principals. The most obvious conclusion is that teachers make the best evaluators." External observers, district supervisory personnel, and peers can also make useful contributions. Although self-evaluation is not a valid

indicator of what kind of job an assistant principal is doing, the procedure is not without value. Self-evaluation causes the rater to clarify his/her perceptions of personal performance and to carefully review the performance criteria and standards being used to measure that performance. Despite the values of teachers' feedback of administrators, few administrator evaluation systems actually provide for input from staff members.

The problem for this study will be to develop a list of reliable and discriminating items to be used as a source for evaluation instruments. Discriminating items will be defined as those items that elicit both similar responses from members of the group rating a particular principal, and maximum difference in rating among the assistant principals being rated ( $p \leq .05$ ).

The problem can be more specifically defined by the following questions:

1. What do assistant principals do now?
2. What critical work activities have been identified by the Look research?
3. What do practicing assistant principals suggest for criteria?
4. Which of these items can be substantiated by research on effective schools?
5. What is the discrimination power and reliability of items when tested by the Menne-Tolsma formula (using 15 raters assessing 30 vice-principals in selected school districts)?

### Purposes of the Study

The purposes of this study are two-fold. First, to generate a list of assistant principal competencies that can be observed and rated by teachers, assistant principals, principals, and superintendents or other central office supervisors. These lists were partially developed by collecting and reviewing 30 day time-logs and by interviewing administrators in Waterloo Community School District, Waterloo, Iowa; Fruitport Community School District, Fruitport, Michigan; and East Allen County School District, New Haven, Indiana. These critical work activities were compared to similar lists of work activities for school administrators that Look (58) and other researchers had developed.

The second purpose of this study is to develop a list of items that can be used to discriminate situation-specific, assistant principal performance. Ultimately, this list of discriminating items could be used by school districts to develop assistant principal evaluation instruments.

Several objectives were specified at the onset of this study. First was the development of a list of assistant principal behaviors based upon field studies and a review of literature. After these behaviors were delineated, a list of performance items relating to each behavior was developed. Next a survey instrument was developed using performance statements that attempted to measure the performance of assistant principals as related to the identified competencies generated from field observations. This instrument was pilot-tested to determine the appropriateness of criteria and then administered to 46 assistant principals who had agreed to participate in the study. Each participant

marked the instrument herself/himself, selected a central office administrator to mark the instrument, asked his/her principal to rate their performance and also selected a minimum of 13 teachers to mark the instrument.

This instrument tested two hypotheses:

1. There is no significant difference in the discriminating power of the items on the assistant principal performance criteria questionnaire.
2. There will be no significant difference in the items seen as appropriate by each rater group (teachers, assistant principals, principals, and superintendents or central office supervisors).

#### Assumptions

During this study it was assumed that assistant principal performance can be described in terms of competencies and behaviors. It was further assumed that assistant principal performance can be measured in terms of these established competencies and behaviors. Another assumption made during this study was that assistant principal competencies and behaviors can be described adequately enough to permit raters to make valid judgments. That raters would provide an honest assessment of assistant principal performance was also assumed. The final assumption of the study was that a discriminating item has been identified when an item elicits both a similar response from members of the group rating a particular assistant principal and maximum difference in rating among the assistant principals being rated when tested by the Menne-Tolsma formula (33).

### Delimitations

This study was delimited by asking the raters to mark specific observable behaviors and not general skills or attitudes. Only assistant principals in secondary high schools or junior high schools were selected to participate in this study. This study was further delimited by making no assessment of school climate or student achievement as a measure of assistant principal effectiveness. The final delimitation is that the survey was administered to selected teachers, assistant principals, principals, and superintendents or central office supervisors during the spring semester of 1988.



## CHAPTER II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

## Evaluation of Assistant Principals

Purpose

Because the assistant principal plays a vital role in the learning processes of the whole school, effective assistant principal performance evaluation is especially important. "More systematic appraisal programs for teachers, a broader definition of accountability, and the increasing need for school systems to justify the increasing costs of education all have played a part in moving the role and functions of the educational administrator to the forefront" (46). Rising taxes and falling test scores have contributed to the public's demand for proof of increased effectiveness and have created what Nicholson (75) called the "accountability syndrome." Bolton (7) believed that "the public wants to hold the profession accountable for incompetent or ineffective members," and that this concern for accountability was the real reason for establishing personnel evaluation laws. Sapone (95), Hunt and Buser (45), Pharis (80), Rosenberg (91), and McCleary (65) all discussed the increased awareness of and interest in administrator evaluation and stressed the need for improved assessment techniques and procedures to meet the public's demands.

Accountability to the public is only one reason for administrator evaluation. Performance appraisal should also be a process for efficient planning to prevent or provide for the correction of errors (2).

Evaluation can be conducted for several reasons:

(1) To establish a basis for change of individual behavior such that both personal satisfaction and organizational effectiveness are improved, (2) to collect factual information about performance in relation to specified objectives, and (3) to assist in making decisions about compensation, promotion, transfer, or dismissal (36).

McIntyre (67) stated that evaluation has two main purposes: (1) It should support certain types of administrative decisions such as re-employment, reassignment, promotion, or dismissal, and (2) it should improve the administrator's performance.

Despite the public outcry for accountability, performance improvement is probably the most important reason for establishing performance evaluation systems. In a comprehensive 1982 survey of the laws of all 50 states, Wuhs (112) found that the improvement of performance was the most frequently stated purpose for the legislative statutes which established requirements for performance evaluation. Dismissal was the second most frequent reason. Only two states recorded accountability as a reason for performance appraisal.

#### Legal requirements

The public wants evidence that school personnel are effective in their jobs; and that if they are not effective, efforts are being made to either improve their performance or release them from their jobs. In this context, surprisingly, "Formal evaluation of school administrators is a recent development in the widespread movement toward educational accountability" (10). McDonald and others (66) found that in the early 1970s, only nine states had legally mandated administrator evaluation as

one component of the educational program. In 1982, Wuhs (112) found that 22 states required administrator evaluation. She noted that nine states had mandated evaluation within the last several years and believed that such actions might indicate forthcoming mandates in other states.

Interestingly, the majority of requirements for teachers and administrators were contained within the same ruling. For example, North Carolina's law called for the evaluation of "professional public school employees," while the statute in Arkansas required that "any person, exclusive of the superintendent, who is required to hold a teaching certificate" be evaluated. In some states, such as California, administrator performance evaluation was required in a subsection within the teacher evaluation law. Wuhs (112) reported that 22 of the 26 states that required teacher evaluation also required administrator evaluation. No states were reported to require administrator evaluation without teacher evaluation. This situation was seen positively by Manatt et al. (103), who asserted that an effective teacher evaluation system was possible only if teacher evaluators were in turn evaluated by others.

Wuhs (112) reached several important conclusions about the current state of teacher and administrator performance evaluation: (1) Because the requirements differed so greatly, evaluation of performance varied throughout the country. "Some of the requirements are explicit and complete while others are vague and/or buried within other requirements." (2) Confusion about requirements continued to exist even in states that have had evaluation for a long period of time. (3) Some question existed about the implementation and compliance with laws mandating performance

evaluation. It appeared that unless initial legislation was comprehensive and provided the authority for follow-up and verification, implementation might not occur. For example, Louisiana mandated evaluation in 1977, then passed a monitoring law in 1980 to give the State Department of Education the authority to oversee implementation. Monitoring became necessary because little progress in the implementation of the requirements had occurred in the previous three years.

#### Input from multiple raters

The process of performance evaluation is not exact. As many people as possible should be involved in the evaluation process because the collective judgment of the group can help to offset personal bias (9). The evaluation instrument used to gather data serves as a powerful diagnostic tool for those who supervise principals. Information obtained from external observers, teachers, and self-evaluations can be used by supervisory personnel in the coaching and counseling process designed to help principals improve their performance.

Several studies and articles suggest that teachers should be involved in principal evaluation (9). Lewis (52) summarized a report by the National Education Association which stated that three out of four teachers believed that teachers should evaluate principals. Licata (55) pointed to "evidence that teacher assessments of the performance of principals relate significantly to school climate and certain school outcomes." Although teacher data should be considered "tentative" according to Licata, he believed that input from teachers should be

included in any plan to improve the leadership abilities of school principals. The Educational Research Service (25) cited the benefits of teacher participation by stating that the evaluation process should facilitate communication and staff participation, especially in the identification of needs, establishment of objectives, and assessment of organizational and individual performance. Lewis (52), Licata (55), Deal, Dornbusch, and Crawford (22), Gaut (33), and Zakrajsek (113) all have concluded that a need existed for staff participation in principal evaluation. Yet, despite these arguments for teacher input, few evaluation systems reported in the literature incorporated such participation. Evaluation systems such as those discussed by Stow and Manatt (102), Sanacore (94), Sweeney (105), and Ellett (27) were exceptions.

Self-evaluation may not be a reliable indicator of what kind of job a principal is doing; however, the process is not without value. Self-evaluation causes the rater to clarify his/her own perception of performance and to carefully review the evaluation criteria and standards being used to measure that performance. It also tends to reduce the threat of an external evaluator and to increase the potential for creativity and motivation (2).

#### Current practice

McDonald and others (67) placed the currently used processes for administrator evaluation into two major categories: (1) Those which used predetermined performance standards, and (2) those which employed

individual job performance goals derived through cooperative efforts between the principal and the superordinate. An Educational Research Service Study (25) identified 12 basic types of evaluation procedures within these two major categories. Ludwig (60) added a third category which she entitled "informal" and defined as the absence of a formal evaluation system.

A review of the literature supported the following generalizations about the evaluation systems currently in use.

Philosophical assumptions Most evaluation systems shared common philosophical assumptions: (1) The assistant principal's productivity can and should be evaluated (67). (2) Evaluation must be based on mutually understood and accepted criteria (67). (3) Standards of excellence should be designed to be used by the administrator as yardsticks against which to measure performance (67). (4) The evaluation process should provide each principal with insights into specific areas of strength, of needed improvement, and with guidance as to how to achieve greater effectiveness (55). (5) Evaluation programs can bring long-term beneficial results by improving administrator performance (67).

Procedural steps Most formal evaluation systems involved four procedural steps according to Ludwig (60): (1) A pre-conference was held to review procedures. (2) A data gathering phase followed which may or may not have included formal or informal formative conferences. Self-evaluation and teachers' ratings were sometimes, but not frequently, part of this step. (3) A summative conference was held in which the principal and superordinate reviewed the evaluation. New job targets were developed

at this point if the system employed individual performance standards.

(4) Systematic follow-up was provided.

Checklists      The checklists developed to serve as rating instruments in principal performance evaluation were based largely on content validity judgments by experts and practitioners. Specific sources included job descriptions published by professional organizations, compiled by researchers, or written by local school districts. Many of the most recently developed instruments included the results of the latest studies on effective schools. Extensive field tests were usually not conducted. The Georgia Principal Assessment System was one notable exception. No tests of reliability were reported for any of the instruments reviewed.

Item validity and discrimination power      Many of the checklists and rating instruments reviewed were based on competency statements which described exactly what activities the assistant principal was expected to do in an instructional setting as a result of his/her training and experience (17). Such scales provided specific descriptors in place of global generalizations. A rational analysis of these checklists showed that most items were found on more than one list. The most frequently evaluated behaviors were: Maintains communication with community members and parents, follows district policies and state laws, conducts evaluation of the school program, evaluates staff, works cooperatively with staff members, holds regular staff meetings, helps teachers to utilize student achievement data, supervises student record keeping, maintains student discipline, establishes goals based on identified needs, schedules students and teachers, develops building budget, maintains building and

grounds, provides instructional materials, encourages professional growth, and interviews and selects personnel. A literature search found that apparently no research has been conducted to determine the discrimination power of checklist items relating to the specific duties of assistant principals. Look's study (58) is noteworthy in the literature as an example of checklist competency statements for elementary and secondary principals which have been tested for their power to discriminate between job performance. No other studies were found that tested the discrimination power of competency statements related to the duties of school administrators.

#### Selection of Items with Discrimination Power

Researchers agree on the competencies exhibited by good administrators and the need to select items for assistant principal evaluation instruments to reflect these competencies. However, content validity alone is not a sufficient criterion for item selection. Item discrimination power should also be considered to ensure that items are included which identify differences between the performance of different assistant principals. The methodology employed by Hidlebaugh (41) in 1973 in developing a multi-appraiser teacher evaluation model, in 1983 by Look (58) in selecting criteria for the evaluation of principals, by Judkins (50) in determining items for student evaluation of teachers in 1987, by Lueders (61) in 1987 in selecting criteria for the evaluation of superintendents, and by Uhl (107) in selecting criteria for counselor



evaluation in 1988 will be used to identify discriminating items for the performance appraisal of assistant principals.

Menne (68) listed three conditions which must be present in order to have evidence that a rating scheme does, in fact, measure differences:

(1) There must be more than one rater; (2) the raters must closely agree on their ratings; and (3) the ratings must indicate differences between the persons rated. In regard to the first condition, he believed that "there is no check on a single rater that would give evidence that he is even rating the performance aspect intended."

In discussing the second condition, Menne (68) used teacher performance as an example. He stated:

The second condition means, for example, that if all raters indicated that a given teacher rated a score of four out of a possible five points on some performance aspect, such as 'well prepared for class,' then this consistency of raters indicates something may have been measured. On the other hand, if the ratings of the same teacher varied from one to five, then nothing has been measured--the average rating in such a situation would be a misleading statistic. Therefore, there must be a consistency or a low variance between raters.

To illustrate the importance of the third condition, that ratings must indicate differences between the persons rated, Menne (68) again used an example based on teacher performance evaluation. However, his statements can be generalized to administrator performance evaluation as well.

If all students in a class were asked the sex of their teacher, there would be consistency (low, or in this case, zero variance) in the responses of this group of student 'raters.' Other classes, with the same or different students, should also have a consistent response to the question. But if the teachers are not all of the same sex, there will be a difference in the responses *between* classes. So teacher ratings must be

consistent and also must indicate differences between the performance of different teachers.

Menne and Tolsma (69) stressed the importance of item discrimination for instruments used to measure characteristics of individuals by means of group or multi-rater responses. They noted that between-group and within-group variances are important characteristics when assessing whether a particular item on a group or multi-rater measuring instrument measures differences. Items which have a pattern of low within-group variance in relationship to the between-group variance are considered to be discriminating items. Menne and Tolsma stated:

The percentage of the total sum of squares (SS) due to 'between groups,' i.e., between teachers or principals, is an appropriate index of item discrimination. The between and the within-groups SS add to the total SS. Characteristics of one institution, classroom or teacher can be distinguished from those of another, provided the consensual responses made by the members of the respective groups are different. In other words, the items selected must be capable of (a) eliciting similar responses from members of the same group, and (b) eliciting different responses from members belonging to a different group when the groups in question have, in fact, been exposed to or have perceived dissimilar conditions. Therefore, whether or not an item contained in an instrument designed to measure group responses is a discriminating one can be inferred from the pattern of between-group and within-group variances. For discrimination, the within-group variance should be low in relationship to the between-group variance.

Performance must be measured before it can be evaluated. One way to ensure that performance has been measured is by making certain that the conditions for meaningful measurement, as outlined by Menne and Tolsma (69), are met.

## Summary

Experts agree that the assistant principal plays a key role in the operation of the successful school. He/she is the implementer of new programs, policies, and procedures in addition to following through on the established routines of a building. The responsibilities of individual assistant principals vary from position to position, but generally parallel the responsibilities of a building principal. Of all the performance data reviewed, the Look (58) study was most useful to the present investigation. The administrator performance criteria that she identified were further validated by the critical work activity studies of the School Improvement Model team at Iowa State University.

In order to make district specific evaluation instruments for Waterloo Community School District, Waterloo, Iowa; Fruitport Community School District, Fruitport, Michigan; and East Allen Community School District, New Haven, Indiana, the School Improvement Model team had assistant principals, among others, time log everything they did for 20 working days. Examining these critical work activity time logs and the pool of items that Look (58) developed resulted in the conclusion that her list was all-inclusive and that no other assistant principal behaviors needed to be included in this study.

## CHAPTER III. METHODS

This study identified criteria for evaluation of secondary assistant principals which may be used by local schools to build evaluation instruments or to refine currently used instruments to provide a more accurate assessment of assistant principal performance. A questionnaire was developed and administered to teachers, assistant principals, principals, and superintendents or other central office administrators. The development of the questionnaire, subjects participating, procedures for data collection, and the statistical analyses employed are described in this chapter.

## Questionnaire Construction

Item selection for this questionnaire (see Appendix) was based on a review of evaluation instruments, job descriptions, and performance criteria listings (1, 3, 7, 10, 13, 18, 20, 23, 24, 25, 27, 33, 48, 58). Additional criteria for administrator behaviors were gleaned from the critical work activity time logs completed by assistant principals who have participated in the Iowa State University School Improvement Model (SIM) Projects. These behaviors were further validated by on-site interviews of assistant principals at Waterloo Community School District, Waterloo, Iowa; East Allen Community School District, New Haven, Indiana; and Fruitport Community Schools, Fruitport, Michigan. This selection process resulted in a criteria pool containing many duplications and similar items which in effect provided a sort of social validity/mass

authorship providing a means for determining which items to include in the survey.

Teachers, assistant principals, principals, and superintendents were given identical survey instruments and instructions. All raters were asked to respond to a five-point Likert scale (never or strongly disagree, seldom or disagree, sometimes or neither agree or disagree, often or agree, always or strongly agree). The raters were instructed to not respond to any items that they had not observed.

In early February of 1988, the questionnaire was administered to a volunteer group of Iowa State University graduate students majoring in Educational Administration. After analyzing the results of this research field test, it was decided that no further refinements in the instrument were needed.

#### Selection of the Sample and Collection of the Data

Subjects who participated in this study were from 16 school districts. Twelve subjects volunteered following a November 1987 meeting of assistant principals sponsored by the School Administrators of Iowa. The other subjects came from school districts that had received staff development training or had in other ways been involved with a project of Iowa State University's School Improvement Model (SIM). Table 1 lists the districts and the number of raters' employment positions.

In April of 1988, a packet of materials was mailed to each subject. Each packet contained 20 envelopes with the name of the assistant principal being rated in the upper left-hand corner. The rater's

Table 1. Districts and employment position of raters who participated

	Teacher raters	Self- raters	Central office raters	Principal raters	Total raters	Number of assistant principals
1. North Scott Community School Dist. Eldridge, Iowa	33	2	2	2	39	2
2. Centerville Community School Dist. Centerville, Iowa	17	1	1	1	20	1
3. Iowa City Community School Dist. Iowa City, Iowa	59	4	3	4	70	4
4. Fort Dodge Community School Dist. Fort Dodge, Iowa	89	6	6	5	106	6
5. Oskaloosa Community School Dist. Oskaloosa, Iowa	17	1	1	1	20	1
6. Marion Community School Dist. Marion, Iowa	14	1	1	0	16	1
7. Le Mars Community School Dist. Le Mars, Iowa	17	1	1	1	20	1
8. Muscatine Community School Dist. Muscatine, Iowa	15	1	0	1	17	1
9. Council Bluffs Community School Dist. Council Bluffs, Iowa	16	1	1	1	19	1

Table 1. Continued

	Teacher raters	Self- raters	Central office raters	Principal raters	Total raters	Number of assistant principals				
10. Independence Community School Dist. Independence, Kansas	33	2	1	2	38	2				
11. Lubbock Community School Dist. Lubbock, Texas	130	8	7	7	152	10				
12. Raleigh Independent School Dist. Raleigh, North Carolina	46	3	3	2	54	3				
13. Waterloo Community School Dist. Waterloo, Iowa	40	3	1	2	46	3				
14. East Allen County School Dist. New Haven, Indiana	97	6	6	6	115	6				
15. Fruitport Community Schools Fruitport, Michigan	29	2	2	2	35	2				
16. Liberal Independent Community School Dist. Liberal, Kansas	32	2	2	2	38	2				
Totals	<u>684</u>	+	<u>44</u>	+	<u>38</u>	+	<u>39</u>	-	<u>805</u>	<u>46</u>

employment position (teacher, principal, superintendent, or self-rater) was marked in the upper right-hand corner of these envelopes. Each subject was directed to hand deliver the envelopes to each of the raters. Inside each envelope was a questionnaire, an optical-mark answer sheet, and directions to return the completed answer sheet to the building secretary, who would forward them in a pre-paid mailer to Iowa State University for processing. Only those questionnaires returned by June 15th were utilized in this study.

#### Treatment of Data

Hidlebaugh's (41), Judkins' (50), Look's (58), Lueder's (61), and Uhl's (107) employment of the Menne and Tolsma (69) methodology for determining item discrimination power was used in this study to analyze the 50 items on the assistant principal performance items discriminations questionnaire (Appendix A).

The pattern of between-group and within-group variances was used to determine which items discriminated (69). A certain percentage of the total sum of squares must be due to between-group variance in order for an item to discriminate. Hidlebaugh (41) asserted that:

Since the ratio of between to within-group mean squares, under the usual analysis of variance assumptions, varies as the  $F$  statistic and is also influenced by the size sample, it is more pragmatic to use the percentage of total sum of squares due to between-groups as an appropriate discrimination index (pp. 40-41).

A between-group minimum percentage of the total sums of squares sufficient to discriminate at the .05 level of significance is 13 percent.



Table 2a displays the sources of data analyzed in determining item discrimination. A 15 rater minimum was necessary to meet the requirements of the Menne-Tolsma test.

<u>Source</u>	<u>DF</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Between groups	2-1 = 1	x	$\frac{x}{100-x/28}$	$\frac{4.20}{1}$
Within groups	2(15-1) = 28	<u>100-x</u>		
Total	29	100		

Therefore:

$$\frac{\frac{x}{100-x}}{28} = 4.20$$

$$x = 4.20 \frac{100-x}{28}$$

$$28x = 420 - 4.20x$$

$$(28 + 4.20) x = 420$$

$$32.2x = 420$$

$$x = 13.04$$

$$100 - x = 86.96$$

Table 2a. Analysis of variance for two groups with 15 subjects per group

Source	DF	SS	MS	
Between groups	2-1 = 1	13%	22	13/87/28 = 4.20*
Within groups	2(15-1) = 28	87%	$\frac{87}{28}$	
Total	29	100%		

\*The critical F value with 1 and 28 degrees of freedom at the .05 level is 4.20.

A between-group minimum percentage of the total sums of squares sufficient to discriminate, at the .01 level of significance, is 22 percent. This minimum assumes the item is to distinguish between two assistant principals being rated by at least 15 raters each. The Menne and Tolsma (69, p. 6) formula reasons that:

If an item is a discriminating one in a situation involving a few small groups, then it will also be capable of discriminating among more numerous and/or larger groups. The reverse, of course is not true.

A Cronbach-alpha reliability coefficient was also computed for all criteria established as discriminating at the .05 level of significance to provide an estimate for internal consistency. This procedure assesses the inter-item consistency or homogeneity of the items and is used for measures which have multiple-scored scales.

An analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to test the statistical significance of group means for each item by rater positions. The Duncan multiple range test was calculated for each item that discriminated to determine which group means differed significantly.

## CHAPTER IV. FINDINGS

## Introduction

The primary focus for this study was the identification of criteria for the evaluation of secondary school assistant principals based upon item discrimination power. To accomplish this task, a 50-item questionnaire was used to collect data from teachers, principals, assistant principals, and superintendents or other central office supervisors. Subjects were from school districts of various size and location throughout the continental United States.

During the study, subjects from 16 school districts used a 5-point Likert-type scale to rate the performance of a designated assistant principal on each of 50 items. Items which discriminated at the .05 and .01 level of significance were identified using the Menne and Tolsma (69) method to determine item discrimination power.

Not all of the data collected were analyzed. A theoretical minimum of 15 raters for each assistant principal was established for the item discrimination portion that utilized the Menne and Tolsma (69) methodology because it is possible for an item to be discriminating in a situation where there are several large groups but not discriminating in a situation involving a few small groups. Results of the Menne and Tolsma (69) methodology are reported for 46 assistant principals rated by 812 subjects. Twenty-four other assistant principals who received the research questionnaire either chose not to participate, returned their questionnaires after June 15, 1988, or returned their questionnaires with fewer than 15 respondents.

In this chapter, each of the research hypotheses presented in Chapter I will be restated and the results of the statistical test will then be displayed in table form. The instrument used in data collection can be found in the Appendix.

### Item Discrimination Questionnaire

#### Research hypothesis 1

Research hypothesis 1 stated that there would be no significant difference in the discriminating power of the items on the assistant principal performance criteria questionnaire. In order to determine if the discrimination power of the items differed, the adaptation of the Menne and Tolsma (69) methodology previously used by Hidlebaugh (41), Look (58), Judkins (50), Lueders (61), and Uhl (107) was followed for determining the item discrimination index for each item on the instrument. This analysis indicated that a total of 50 items had a sum of squares between-groups variance equal to or exceeding 13% of the total sums of squares variance, the criteria established for determination at the .05 level of significance. It further indicated that a total of 25 items had a sum of squares between-groups variance equal to or exceeding 22% of the total sums of squares variance, the criteria established for determination of the .01 level of significance. The Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient calculated to determine the internal consistency of all items with a discrimination value equal to or exceeding 13 percent was equal to .992. The discrimination value for each item is shown in Table 2b.

Table 2b. Item discrimination values in percent (analysis based on 805 subjects in 46 groups)

Item number	Item	Item discrimination in percent <sup>a</sup>
1	The assistant principal provides materials and resources necessary for the instructional program.	29
2	The assistant principal uses evaluation findings to make decisions to expand, revise, or suspend programs.	19
3	The assistant principal organizes a system in which teachers work cooperatively to develop and implement instructional objectives.	26
4	The assistant principal regularly inspects plant facilities to check conditions and corrects unsafe or unsatisfactory conditions.	30
5	The assistant principal interprets school policies and procedures to parents and informs them of changes that occur.	19
6	The assistant principal schedules meetings with staff to discuss responsibilities, assignments, or changes.	20
7	The assistant principal takes a strong interest in teachers' professional development.	27
8	The assistant principal provides parents with regular reports of their child's progress and encourages them to confer frequently with staff members.	19
9	The assistant principal keeps students informed of the school's goals, policies, and activities.	16
10	The assistant principal maintains a well-organized comprehensive and continuous student testing program.	23

<sup>a</sup> 13% equals discrimination at the .05 level of significance; 22% equals discrimination at the .01 level of significance.

Table 2b. Continued

Item number	Item	Item discrimination in percent
11	The assistant principal promotes activities to identify, analyze, and solve instructional problems.	28
12	The assistant principal encourages a free and open flow of comments, suggestions, and recommendations from staff.	19
13	The assistant principal schedules instructional space for maximum utilization and strives for minimum disruption of instruction.	20
14	The assistant principal provides supervisory assistance at student activities.	14
15	The assistant principal makes regular, systematic, and cooperative appraisals of each staff member's performance, always including a follow-up conference.	42
16	The assistant principal assigns responsibilities and duties equitably and bases assignments on the skills and capabilities of staff members.	18
17	The assistant principal asks for teacher input concerning the changing needs for time and space for various instructional purposes.	20
18	The assistant principal keeps the community well informed concerning school's activities, needs, and opportunities.	23
19	The assistant principal demonstrates knowledge of the teaching/learning process and gives information or provides assistance from others.	26
20	The assistant principal defines goals and objectives of the school and works toward articulation between schools and grades.	25
21	The assistant principal collects, organizes, and interprets data concerning other than teacher influences on learning.	23

Table 2b. Continued

Item number	Item	Item discrimination in percent
22	The assistant principal recognizes and supports differences in teachers and teaching styles.	17
23	The assistant principal discusses duties and responsibilities with teachers before assignment and on a continuous basis.	14
24	The assistant principal protects staff from unreasonable demands by parents and/or community members.	15
25	The assistant principal encourages teachers to use community resources and enlists community support for school projects.	19
26	The assistant principal provides support and direction for those staff members seeking to improve their skills.	21
27	The assistant principal supervises student record keeping and handling of official forms and documents.	14
28	The assistant principal informs staff of school policies and procedures.	14
29	The assistant principal encourages teachers to try innovative ideas and keeps staff informed of the latest educational developments.	31
30	The assistant principal provides a variety of instructional programs to meet individual learner needs.	28
31	The assistant principal provides procedures for the security of school facilities and safety for all personnel.	24
32	The assistant principal emphasizes student achievement with teachers and students on a regular basis.	18

Table 2b. Continued

Item number	Item	Item discrimination in percent
33	The assistant principal provides positive reinforcement to teachers for their efforts and accomplishments--formally and informally.	21
34	The assistant principal provides for organizing, collecting, and analyzing data to be used to identify curriculum needs (changes in scope, sequence, materials, etc.).	27
35	The assistant principal sets high standards of conduct and monitors all facets of school life to insure that these standards are met.	23
36	The assistant principal monitors the curriculum and identifies progress toward stated curriculum/program goals.	32
37	The assistant principal supervises student transportation.	40
38	The assistant principal stimulates interest in the school by scheduling and/or attending programs and activities.	13
39	The assistant principal evaluates instructional techniques.	37
40	The assistant principal assists teachers to establish effective relationships with individual students.	20
41	The assistant principal maintains high standards for cleanliness, lighting, heating, ventilation, sanitation, and comfort.	19
42	The assistant principal involves representative students in the work of important school activities.	25
43	The assistant principal coordinates and/or attends staffing conferences to assess a learner's needs.	21



Table 2b. Continued

Item number	Item	Item discrimination in percent
44	The assistant principal helps teachers devise individual instructional goals.	30
45	The assistant principal discusses student problems or progress with teachers regularly.	19
46	The assistant principal organizes the faculty to evaluate curriculum on a continuous basis.	32
47	The assistant principal has high expectations for student academic achievement.	19
48	The assistant principal works with problem students in designing the appropriate behavior measures for all students.	25
49	The assistant principal coordinates the budget developing process.	30
50	The assistant principal develops inservice programs for the staff.	37

Research hypothesis 2

Research hypothesis 2 stated that there would be no significant difference in the items seen as appropriate by each rater group (teachers, assistant principals, principals, and superintendents or central office supervisors).

In order to determine if there were significant differences between rater groups, a one-way analysis of variance and a Duncan multiple comparison were utilized to explore the relationship among the rankings of the four groups of raters. This treatment of the data revealed significant differences between rater positions on 17 of the questionnaire items. Seventeen items were significant at the .05 level. Fourteen of these 17 items were rated significantly lower by the principal raters than by the teacher raters or central office raters (i.e., items 10, 21, 49, 45, 42, 20, 37, 32, 22, 18, 5, 47, 4, 34, 27, 46, and 43). The central office ratings are significantly greater/higher than the principals' in 12 of these 16 items (i.e., 10, 21, 49, 45, 42, 20, 37, 32, 5, 47, 4, and 27). The assistant principals rater group marked themselves significantly lower than the teacher rater group in four of the 16 items (i.e., 10, 49, 20, 34). These data are displayed in Table 3. The mean ratings of each subgroup are displayed in Table 4.

Table 3. One-way analysis of variance, means, standard deviations, and Duncan multiple comparisons between rater positions based on responses to discriminating items in rank order by F-ratio

Item no.	Item	Analysis of variance		Teacher		Asst. principal self-evaluation		Central office supervisor		Principal/supervisor		Grand		Duncan multiple comparison <sup>a</sup>
		F	p<	Mean (N)	SD	Mean (N)	SD	Mean (N)	SD	Mean (N)	SD	Mean (N)	SD	
10	The assistant principal maintains a well-organized comprehensive and continuous student testing program.	8.64	.001	2.99(378)	1.36	2.15(34)	1.13	3.14(28)	1.15	2.12(34)	1.09	2.88(474)	1.34	Prin < tchrs and COS; AP < tchrs and COS
21	The assistant principal collects, organizes, and interprets data concerning other than teacher influences on learning.	6.63	.001	3.60(442)	1.08	3.27(45)	1.23	3.46(28)	1.14	2.81(36)	1.12	3.51(551)	1.12	Prin < COS and tchrs
49	The assistant principal coordinates the budget developing process.	6.35	.001	3.06(304)	1.34	2.32(34)	1.20	3.15(26)	1.12	2.29(34)	1.17	2.93(398)	1.33	Prin < tchrs and COS; AP < tchrs and COS
45	The assistant principal discusses student problems or progress with teachers regularly.	5.78	.001	3.83(629)	1.06	4.23(47)	1.00	4.47(32)	.76	3.82(38)	.95	3.88(746)	1.06	Prin < COS; tchrs < AP and COS
42	The assistant principal involves representative students in the work of important school activities.	5.72	.001	3.91(537)	1.05	3.62(45)	1.01	4.37(30)	.72	3.42(38)	1.11	3.88(650)	1.05	Prin < tchrs and COS; AP < COS; tchrs < COS
20	The assistant principal defines goals and objectives of the school and works toward articulation between schools and grades.	4.37	.005	3.83(555)	1.01	3.47(47)	1.06	3.94(32)	.91	3.35(37)	1.06	3.78(671)	1.02	Prin < tchrs and COS; AP < tchrs
37	The assistant principal supervises student transportation.	4.20	.006	3.86(457)	1.23	3.80(40)	1.38	3.90(29)	1.24	3.11(37)	1.37	3.81(563)	1.26	Prin < AP, tchrs, and COS

<sup>a</sup>Duncan multiple comparisons significant at  $p < .05$ . Abbreviations: Prin = principals, AP = assistant principals, tchrs = teachers, COS = central office supervisors, ns = not significant.

Table 3. Continued

Item no.	Item	Analysis of variance		Teacher		Asst. principal self-evaluation		Central office supervisor		Principal/supervisor		Grand		Duncan multiple comparison
		F	p<	Mean (N)	SD	Mean (N)	SD	Mean (N)	SD	Mean (N)	SD	Mean (N)	SD	
32	The assistant principal emphasizes student achievement with teachers and students on a regular basis.	3.77	.011	3.71(604)	1.08	3.86(49)	.82	4.17(30)	.70	3.34(38)	1.02	3.72(721)	1.06	Prin < tchrs, AP, and COS; tchrs < COS
22	The assistant principal recognizes and supports differences in teachers and teaching styles.	3.60	.013	4.15(652)	.93	4.32(47)	.69	3.94(33)	.90	3.73(37)	.90	4.13(769)	.92	Prin < tchrs and AP
18	The assistant principal keeps the community well-informed concerning school's activities, needs, and opportunities.	3.44	.017	3.76(508)	1.04	3.44(45)	1.16	3.78(32)	.98	3.29(38)	1.14	3.71(623)	1.05	Prin < tchrs
5	The assistant principal interprets school policies and procedures to parents and informs them of changes that occur.	3.05	.028	4.28(619)	.81	4.29(45)	.73	4.39(33)	.61	3.90(39)	.99	4.27(736)	.81	Prin < tchrs, AP, and COS
47	The assistant principal has high expectations for student academic achievement.	3.04	.028	4.19(615)	.85	4.40(48)	.87	4.42(33)	.75	3.92(39)	.90	4.20(735)	.85	Prin < AP and COS
4	The assistant principal regularly inspects plant facilities to check conditions and corrects unsafe or unsatisfactory conditions.	2.91	.034	3.94(530)	1.04	4.09(45)	.97	4.32(28)	.82	3.61(38)	1.15	3.95(641)	1.04	Prin < AP and COS
34	The assistant principal provides for organizing, collecting, and analyzing data to be used to identify curriculum needs (changes in scope, sequence, materials, etc.).	2.72	.044	3.34(426)	1.26	2.94(46)	1.20	3.43(28)	1.10	2.92(37)	1.16	3.28(537)	1.25	AP < tchrs

Table 3. Continued

Item no.	Item	Analysis of variance		Teacher		Asst. principal self-evaluation		Central office supervisor		Principal/supervisor		Grand		Duncan multiple comparison
		F	p<	Mean (N)	SD	Mean (N)	SD	Mean (N)	SD	Mean (N)	SD	Mean (N)	SD	
27	The assistant principal supervises student record keeping and handling of official forms and documents.	2.68	.046	4.01(489)	1.03	3.74(46)	1.24	4.20(30)	.92	3.63(38)	1.26	3.97(603)	1.06	Prin < tchrs and COS
46	The assistant principal organizes the faculty to evaluate curriculum on a continuous basis.	2.63	.049	3.02(456)	1.27	2.66(41)	1.20	3.22(27)	1.01	2.58(36)	1.05	2.97(560)	1.24	ns
43	The assistant principal coordinates and/or attends staffing conferences to assess a learner's needs.	2.62	.050	3.98(517)	1.01	3.78(45)	1.08	4.18(28)	.86	3.58(36)	1.11	3.95(626)	1.02	Prin < tchrs and COS
40	The assistant principal assists teachers to establish effective relationships with individual students.	2.60	.051	3.85(614)	1.00	3.93(46)	1.00	4.35(31)	.75	3.89(38)	1.01	3.88(729)	1.00	Tchrs < COS
24	The assistant principal protects staff from unreasonable demands by parents and/or community members.	2.50	.058	4.12(601)	.92	4.33(45)	.80	4.37(30)	.61	3.87(39)	.92	4.13(715)	.91	Prin < AP and COS
3	The assistant principal organizes a system in which teachers work cooperatively to develop and implement instructional objectives.	2.47	.061	3.52(570)	1.22	3.26(47)	1.21	3.72(29)	.96	3.08(36)	1.02	3.49(682)	1.20	Prin < tchrs and COS
41	The assistant principal maintains high standards for cleanliness, lighting, heating, ventilation, sanitation, and comfort.	2.44	.064	3.99(558)	1.07	4.25(44)	.84	4.31(29)	.81	3.74(38)	1.22	4.01(669)	1.06	Prin < AP and COS

Table 3. Continued

Item no.	Item	Analysis of variance		Teacher		Asst. principal self-evaluation		Central office supervisor		Principal/supervisor		Grand		Duncan multiple comparison
		F	p<	Mean (N)	SD	Mean (N)	SD	Mean (N)	SD	Mean (N)	SD	Mean (N)	SD	
30	The assistant principal provides a variety of instructional programs to meet individual learner needs.	2.41	.066	3.15(461)	1.24	2.76(45)	1.09	3.42(31)	.85	2.92(36)	1.18	3.12(573)	1.21	AP < tchrs and COS
13	The assistant principal schedules instructional space for maximum utilization and strives for minimum disruption of instruction.	2.34	.072	3.90(563)	1.10	3.77(47)	1.18	4.19(31)	.87	3.54(39)	1.14	3.88(680)	1.10	Prin < COS
9	The assistant principal keeps students informed of the school's goals, policies, and activities.	2.24	.083	4.10(633)	.95	3.83(47)	1.11	4.12(34)	.88	3.79(39)	.98	4.07(753)	.98	ns
38	The assistant principal stimulates interest in the school by scheduling and/or attending programs and activities.	1.95	.121	4.32(656)	.84	4.38(48)	1.04	4.61(33)	.70	4.13(39)	.95	4.32(776)	.86	Prin < COS
11	The assistant principal promotes activities to identify, analyze, and solve instructional problems.	1.90	.128	3.42(552)	1.20	3.19(47)	1.31	3.65(31)	.80	3.08(38)	1.15	3.40(668)	1.19	ns
36	The assistant principal monitors the curriculum and identifies progress toward stated curriculum/program goals.	1.89	.130	3.43(459)	1.24	3.15(46)	1.17	3.45(29)	.99	3.03(38)	1.10	3.38(572)	1.22	ns
2	The assistant principal uses evaluation findings to make decisions to expand, revise, or suspend programs.	1.78	.150	3.54(519)	1.11	3.50(46)	1.11	3.75(28)	1.08	3.16(38)	1.24	3.52(631)	1.12	Prin < COS

Table 3. Continued

Item no.	Item	Analysis of variance		Teacher		Asst. principal self-evaluation		Central office supervisor		Principal/supervisor		Grand		Duncan multiple comparison
		F	p <	Mean (N)	SD	Mean (N)	SD	Mean (N)	SD	Mean (N)	SD	Mean (N)	SD	
19	The assistant principal demonstrates knowledge of the teaching/learning process and gives information or provides assistance from others.	1.72	.162	3.97(649)	1.00	3.88(49)	.99	4.33(33)	.99	3.87(38)	.99	3.97(769)	1.00	Tchrs < COS
50	The assistant principal develops inservice programs for the staff.	1.66	.175	3.31(461)	1.25	3.23(43)	1.13	3.21(28)	.99	2.83(36)	1.28	3.27(568)	1.24	Prin < tchrs
48	The assistant principal works with problem students in designing the appropriate behavior measures for all students.	1.63	.180	4.27(614)	.95	4.22(45)	1.17	4.47(32)	.72	3.97(38)	1.10	4.26(729)	.97	Prin < COS
7	The assistant principal takes a strong interest in teachers' professional development.	1.60	.187	3.71(650)	1.14	3.68(47)	1.07	4.13(32)	.94	3.59(39)	1.02	3.72(768)	1.12	Tchrs < COS
31	The assistant principal provides procedures for the security of school facilities and safety for all personnel.	1.59	.191	4.15(566)	.95	4.14(44)	1.11	4.32(31)	.87	3.84(38)	1.15	4.14(679)	.97	ns
35	The assistant principal sets high standards of conduct and monitors all facets of school life to insure that these standards are met.	1.54	.203	4.11(640)	1.01	4.06(47)	1.09	4.47(32)	.80	4.00(38)	.99	4.12(757)	1.00	Tchrs < COS
39	The assistant principal evaluates instructional techniques.	1.41	.238	4.04(612)	.98	4.08(48)	1.15	4.10(31)	1.01	3.71(38)	1.01	4.03(729)	.99	Prin < tchrs

Table 3. Continued

Item no.	Item	Analysis of variance		Teacher		Asst. principal self-evaluation		Central office supervisor		Principal/supervisor		Grand		Duncan multiple comparison
		F	p <	Mean (N)	SD	Mean (N)	SD	Mean (N)	SD	Mean (N)	SD	Mean (N)	SD	
17	The assistant principal asks for teacher input concerning the changing needs for time and space for various instructional purposes.	1.39	.246	3.77(606)	1.12	3.72(46)	.96	4.03(30)	.96	3.49(37)	1.22	3.76(719)	1.11	ns
15	The assistant principal makes regular, systematic, and cooperative appraisals of each staff member's performance, always including a follow-up conference.	1.30	.275	4.18(624)	1.14	4.22(46)	1.11	4.38(32)	1.07	3.87(39)	.95	4.17(741)	1.13	ns
8	The assistant principal provides parents with regular reports of their child's progress and encourages them to confer frequently with staff members.	1.12	.341	3.96(567)	1.00	3.83(48)	1.06	4.13(32)	.83	3.74(39)	1.02	3.95(686)	1.00	ns
23	The assistant principal discusses duties and responsibilities with teachers before assignment and on a continuous basis.	.94	.419	3.71(578)	1.10	3.79(47)	.95	4.04(28)	.72	3.65(37)	1.03	3.72(690)	1.07	ns
16	The assistant principal assigns responsibilities and duties equitably and bases assignments on the skills and capabilities of staff members.	.92	.431	3.95(567)	1.04	3.94(47)	1.07	3.97(32)	.86	3.67(39)	1.11	3.93(685)	1.04	ns
14	The assistant principal provides supervisory assistance at student activities.	.89	.448	4.49(664)	.79	4.50(48)	.85	4.66(35)	.53	4.36(39)	.81	4.49(786)	.79	ns



Table 3. Continued

Item no.	Item	Analysis of variance		Teacher		Asst. principal self-evaluation		Central office supervisor		Principal/supervisor		Grand		Duncan multiple comparison
		F	p<	Mean (N)	SD	Mean (N)	SD	Mean (N)	SD	Mean (N)	SD	Mean (N)	SD	
6	The assistant principal schedules meetings with staff to discuss responsibilities, assignments, or changes.	.85	.468	3.76(635)	1.10	3.65(48)	1.04	3.77(30)	1.04	3.49(39)	1.32	3.74(752)	1.11	ns
33	The assistant principal provides positive reinforcement to teachers for their efforts and accomplishments--formally and informally.	.82	.480	4.06(665)	1.06	4.10(49)	.98	4.35(31)	.88	4.05(39)	.89	4.07(784)	1.04	ns
28	The assistant principal informs staff of school policies and procedures.	.73	.537	4.14(645)	.92	4.16(49)	.92	4.18(33)	.73	3.92(37)	.98	4.13(764)	.91	ns
25	The assistant principal encourages teachers to use community resources and enlists community support for school projects.	.72	.539	3.81(568)	1.02	3.81(47)	1.04	4.00(31)	.87	3.64(39)	.96	3.81(685)	1.01	ns
29	The assistant principal encourages teachers to try innovative ideas and keeps staff informed of the latest educational developments.	.69	.557	3.51(593)	1.21	3.37(49)	1.15	3.77(30)	.97	3.51(37)	1.19	3.51(709)	1.20	ns
12	The assistant principal encourages a free and open flow of comments, suggestions, and recommendations from staff.	.59	.622	4.28(676)	.98	4.33(49)	1.01	4.26(34)	.99	4.08(39)	1.01	4.28(798)	.99	ns
1	The assistant principal provides materials and resources necessary for the instructional program.	.44	.723	3.47(588)	1.22	3.55(47)	.93	3.64(28)	1.06	3.33(39)	1.11	3.47(702)	1.19	ns

Table 3. Continued

Item no.	Item	Analysis of variance		Teacher		Asst. principal self-evaluation		Central office supervisor		Principal/ supervisor		Grand		Duncan multiple comparison
		F	p<	Mean (N)	SD	Mean (N)	SD	Mean (N)	SD	Mean (N)	SD	Mean (N)	SD	
44	The assistant principal helps teachers devise individual instructional goals.	.30	.827	3.43(529)	1.24	3.36(44)	1.26	3.58(26)	1.10	3.30(37)	1.10	3.42(636)	1.23	ns
26	The assistant principal provides support and direction for those staff members seeking to improve their skills.	.19	.904	3.92(578)	1.06	4.00(46)	1.05	4.03(32)	.86	3.95(39)	.92	3.93(695)	1.04	ns

Table 4. Homogeneous subsets of rater positions

Item no.	Item
10	The assistant principal maintains a well-organized comprehensive and continuous student testing program.
21	The assistant principal collects, organizes, and interprets data concerning other than teacher influences on learning.
49	The assistant principal coordinates the budget developing process.
45	The assistant principal discusses student problems or progress with teachers regularly.
42	The assistant principal involves representative students in the work of important school activities.
20	The assistant principal defines goals and objectives of the school and works toward articulation between schools and grades.
37	The assistant principal supervises student transportation.
32	The assistant principal emphasizes student achievement with teachers and students on a regular basis.
22	The assistant principal recognizes and supports differences in teachers and teaching styles.
18	The assistant principal keeps the community well-informed concerning school's activities, needs, and opportunities.
5	The assistant principal interprets school policies and procedures to parents and informs them of changes that occur.
47	The assistant principal has high expectations for student academic achievement.

<sup>1</sup> Homogeneous subsets of groups are designated with the letters a, b, or c using the Duncan multiple range test (i.e., group means that are not significantly different).

Teacher mean (N)	Rater positions <sup>†</sup>			Grand mean (N)
	Asst. principal self-evaluation mean (N)	Central office supervisor mean (N)	Principal/ supervisor mean (N)	
2.99(378) <sup>a</sup>	2.15(34) <sup>b</sup>	3.14(28) <sup>a</sup>	2.12(34) <sup>b</sup>	2.88(474)
3.60(442) <sup>a</sup>	3.27(45) <sup>a</sup>	3.46(28) <sup>a</sup>	2.81(36) <sup>b</sup>	3.51(551)
3.06(304) <sup>a</sup>	2.32(34) <sup>b</sup>	3.15(26) <sup>a</sup>	2.29(34) <sup>b</sup>	2.93(398)
3.83(629) <sup>b</sup>	4.23(47) <sup>ab</sup>	4.47(32) <sup>a</sup>	3.82(38) <sup>b</sup>	3.88(746)
3.91(537) <sup>b</sup>	3.62(45) <sup>bc</sup>	4.37(30) <sup>a</sup>	3.42(38) <sup>c</sup>	3.88(650)
3.83(555) <sup>ab</sup>	3.47(47) <sup>bc</sup>	3.94(32) <sup>a</sup>	3.35(37) <sup>c</sup>	3.78(671)
3.86(457) <sup>a</sup>	3.80(40) <sup>a</sup>	3.90(29) <sup>a</sup>	3.11(37) <sup>b</sup>	3.81(563)
3.71(604) <sup>bc</sup>	3.86(49) <sup>ab</sup>	4.17(30) <sup>a</sup>	3.34(38) <sup>c</sup>	3.72(721)
4.15(652) <sup>a</sup>	4.32(47) <sup>a</sup>	3.94(33) <sup>ab</sup>	3.73(37) <sup>b</sup>	4.13(769)
3.76(508) <sup>a</sup>	3.44(45) <sup>ab</sup>	3.78(32) <sup>a</sup>	3.29(38) <sup>b</sup>	3.71(623)
4.28(619) <sup>a</sup>	4.29(45) <sup>a</sup>	4.39(33) <sup>a</sup>	3.90(39) <sup>b</sup>	4.27(736)
4.19(615) <sup>ab</sup>	4.40(48) <sup>a</sup>	4.42(33) <sup>a</sup>	3.92(39) <sup>b</sup>	4.20(735)

Table 4. Continued

Item no.	Item
4	The assistant principal regularly inspects plant facilities to check conditions and corrects unsafe or unsatisfactory conditions.
34	The assistant principal provides for organizing, collecting, and analyzing data to be used to identify curriculum needs (changes in scope, sequence, materials, etc.).
27	The assistant principal supervises student record keeping and handling of official forms and documents.
46	The assistant principal organizes the faculty to evaluate curriculum on a continuous basis.
43	The assistant principal coordinates and/or attends staffing conferences to assess a learner's needs.

Teacher mean (N)	Rater positions			Grand mean (N)
	Asst. principal self-evaluation mean (N)	Central office supervisor mean (N)	Principal/ supervisor mean (N)	
3.94(530) <sup>ab</sup>	4.09(45) <sup>a</sup>	4.32(28) <sup>a</sup>	3.61(38) <sup>b</sup>	3.95(641)
3.34(426) <sup>a</sup>	2.94(46) <sup>a</sup>	3.43(28) <sup>a</sup>	2.92(37) <sup>a</sup>	3.28(537)
4.01(489) <sup>ab</sup>	3.74(46) <sup>b</sup>	4.20(30) <sup>a</sup>	3.63(38) <sup>b</sup>	3.97(603)
3.02(456) <sup>ab</sup>	2.66(41) <sup>b</sup>	3.22(27) <sup>a</sup>	2.58(36) <sup>b</sup>	2.97(560)
3.98(517) <sup>ab</sup>	3.78(45) <sup>ab</sup>	4.18(28) <sup>a</sup>	3.58(36) <sup>b</sup>	3.95(626)

CHAPTER V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS,  
DISCUSSION, RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This study was conducted during 1988 with the primary objective of identifying items useful in the development and/or improvement of instruments used in the evaluation of secondary school assistant principals based on item discrimination power. A secondary objective was to determine if different groups of raters (i.e., superintendent/central office supervisors, principals, teachers, or assistant principals) would rate these items significantly different from other rater groups. A total of 812 subjects participated in this study.

First, the 50 items on the item discrimination questionnaire were selected. To make this selection, evaluation instruments which appeared in the literature were analyzed as were critical work activities logged by secondary assistant principals of schools participating in the School Improvement Model project (SIM), sponsored by Iowa State University. These items were further validated by on-site interviews of assistant principals in the Waterloo Community School District, Waterloo, Iowa; Fruitport Community School District, Fruitport, Michigan; and the East Allen Community School District, New Haven, Indiana. This selection process created a criteria pool that contained many similar items and duplications, thus supporting the concept of social validity/mass authorship providing a means for determining which items to include in the survey.

The next step was to have the instrument administered to teachers, assistant principals, principals, and superintendents or central office supervisors using a five-point Likert-type scale to rate the performance of designated assistant principals on each of the behaviors described on the 50 item questionnaire. The data from this questionnaire were analyzed using the Menne and Tolsma (69) methodology to determine item discrimination power. Items which discriminated at a .05 level of significance were identified. A Cronbach-alpha reliability coefficient was calculated for all items identified as discriminating at the .05 level of significance to provide an estimate of the internal consistency of these items. The data were further analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance and a Duncan multiple comparison between rater positions based on responses to discriminating items in rank order by F-ratio to determine if the different rater groups (i.e., teachers, assistant principals, superintendent or central office supervisor, and principal) ranked the performance of the assistant principals different than other rater groups.

It was hypothesized that differences in item discrimination power would be identified in the analysis of data from the combined rater group for assistant secondary principals and that there would be differences in the rating among the four groups of assistant principal raters. Both hypotheses were supported.

An analysis of the data indicated:

1. All 50 items selected for this questionnaire discriminated at the .05 level of significance for the combined rater groups rating secondary assistant principals. Twenty-five of the 50 items



discriminated at the .01 level of significance for the combined rater groups rating secondary assistant principals.

2. The data reveal significant differences between rater positions on 30 of the questionnaire items.
3. Seventeen of the 50 items on the questionnaire show significant overall F-ratios at the .05 level of significance. The principal group ratings are significantly lower than the teachers and/or superintendent/central office supervisors in 15 of these 17 items. The items that are ranked significantly lower/harsher by principals are: The assistant principal maintains a well-organized, comprehensive, and continuous student testing program; the assistant principal collects, organizes, and interprets data concerning other than teacher influences on learning; the assistant principal coordinates the budget developing process; the assistant principal discusses student problems or progress with teachers regularly; the assistant principal involves representative students in the work of important school activities; the assistant principal defines goals and objectives of the school and works towards articulation between schools and grades; the assistant principal supervises student transportation; the assistant principal emphasizes student achievement with teachers and students on a regular basis; the assistant principal recognizes and supports differences in teachers and teaching style; the assistant principal keeps the community well informed concerning school's activities, needs, and opportunity; the

assistant principal interprets school policy and procedures to parents and informs them of changes that occur; the assistant principal has high expectations for student academic achievement; the assistant principal regularly inspects plant facilities to check unsafe or unsatisfactory conditions; the assistant principal provides for organizing, collecting, and analyzing data to be used to identify curriculum needs (changes in scope, sequence, materials, etc.); the assistant principal supervises student recordkeeping and handling of official forms and documents; the assistant principal organizes the faculty to evaluate curriculum on a continuous basis.

Central office supervisors/superintendents' ratings were significantly higher/greater than the principals rating group in 13 of the 17 significant items on the questionnaire. The items ranked higher by superintendents/central office supervisor than principals are: The assistant principal maintains a well-organized, comprehensive, and continuous testing program; the assistant principal collects, organizes and interprets data concerning other than teacher influences on learning; the assistant principal coordinates the budget developing process; the assistant principal discusses student problems and progress with teachers regularly; the assistant principal involves representative students in the work of important school activities; the assistant principal supervises student transportation; the assistant principal emphasizes student achievement with teachers and students on a regular basis; the assistant principal interprets school policy and procedures to parents and informs

them of changes that occur; the assistant principal has high expectations for student academic achievement; the assistant principal regularly inspects plant facilities to check conditions and correct unsafe or unsatisfactory conditions; the assistant principal supervises student recordkeeping and handling of official forms and documents; and the assistant principal coordinates and/or attends staffing conferences to assess a learner's needs.

It seems clear that some of the 17 items showing significant differences between rater groups cannot be easily evaluated by a group that is subordinate to the assistant principal. Such things as coordinating and developing the budget process received a higher ranking by the teacher rater group than the principal rater group when in fact the teacher rater group is not in a good position to judge how effectively an assistant principal might coordinate the budget process. However, this is not true of the other 16 items which showed significant differences between rater groups. It should be noted that principals ranked the performance of the assistant principals lower than teachers and/or central office supervisors in 24 of the 50 items on the questionnaire. It should also be noted that the central office supervisors/superintendent ranks the performance of assistant principals significantly higher than principals on 20 of the 50 items listed on the questionnaire. This observation led to the portrayal homogeneous subset rater positions on Table 4. An examination of this table reveals that the teacher rater group and central office/superintendent rater groups are in the same homogeneous subset in 46 of the 50 items examined in this study. The four items that did

not fall into the same homogeneous subset are: The assistant principal discusses student problems or progress with teachers regularly; the assistant principal involves representative students in the work of important school activities; the assistant principal emphasizes student achievement with teachers and students on a regular basis; and the assistant principal assists teachers to establish effective relationships with individual students.

### Conclusions

The following conclusions are offered based on the analysis of data collected in this investigation.

1. The Menne and Tolsma (69) methodology for determining the discrimination power of items in instruments using group responses can be used to identify discriminating items for developing or improving existing assistant principal performance evaluation instruments.
2. There is a difference in the discriminating power of the items on the assistant principal performance evaluation instrument used in the study.
3. There are significant differences between the rater positions on 30 of the questionnaire items.
4. The principal rater group ranked the assistant principals more harshly than the teacher rater group and/or the central office supervisor rater group on 15 of the statistically significant

items included on the questionnaire (see Appendix) (i.e., items 10, 21, 49, 45, 42, 20, 37, 32, 22, 18, 5, 47, 4, 27, and 43).

5. The central office supervisors ranked assistant principals significantly greater/higher than the principal rater groups in 13 of the statistically significant items included on the questionnaire (see Table 3) (i.e., items 10, 17, 21, 45, 42, 20, 37, 32, 5, 47, 4, 27, and 43).
6. The principal rater group ranked assistant principals more harshly than teachers and/or central office supervisors in 24 of the 50 items included on this questionnaire (see Table 3).
7. In 46 of the 50 items, teachers and central office supervisors were found to have no significant differences in their mean scores (i.e., they were in the same homogeneous group). The four items that were not in the same group were items 45, 42, 32, and 40.

#### Limitations

Certain limitations were imposed due to the design of the study.

1. Many of the subjects were members of school organizations currently or recently involved in an effort to improve learning through performance appraisal or were participants in one of several workshops designed to improve evaluation skills and thus may have demonstrated a more positive disposition towards educational research than in subjects merely chosen at random.
2. Since participation in this study was voluntary, those who chose to participate may have demonstrated a more positive disposition

for educational research and/or toward the topic under consideration than subjects who refused to participate.

3. Some of the data were eliminated from the Menne and Tolsma (69) treatment because the sample size was lower than the minimum number of 15 rater per assistant principal that was established for this treatment.
4. This study dealt with items that describe specific observable assistant principal behaviors. Item selection, not assistant principal performance, was the focus. No attempt was made to deal with assistant principal effectiveness as measured by student outcome.
5. The discrimination value does not reflect high or low performance nor does it indicate which assistant principal behaviors are most associated with effective leadership. This methodology simply provides a means to determine how well an item measures differences in assistant principal behavior.
6. Discriminating items were selected on the basis of data for all assistant principals rated by 15 or more raters. It is believed that the items identified as discriminating in this study are representative of items which measure differences between assistant principals. The same items may not be discriminating among assistant principals by fewer than 15 raters.

### Discussion

This study set out to identify discriminating items for use in developing assistant principal performance evaluation instruments.

A discriminating item was defined as an item which is capable of eliciting similar responses from persons rating a designated assistant principal and at the same time eliciting different responses from persons rating another assistant principal when the performance of these assistant principals is different. For an item to have discrimination power the variance within the group rating the same assistant principal needs to be low in relationship to the variance between the groups rating different assistant principals. When rating groups were compared, it was evident that principals as a group more harshly rate their immediate subordinates (assistant principals) than do teachers or superintendent/central office supervisors.

This study also revealed that teachers and superintendents or central office supervisors rated the performance of assistant principals in similar manner on most of the items in the survey. This brings up the question of who is the best rater group to rate assistant principals? If the teacher rating group and superintendent/central office supervisor rating group are in agreement most of the time and when their ratings of the performance of the assistant principals are significantly higher than the ratings provided by principals, assistant principals may be more fairly and accurately rated by a group of 15 or more teachers than by the principal. The assistant principalship often is viewed as a position that trains and tests the strengths and weaknesses of the persons heading for

higher administrative positions. In some cases a principal may not wish to rate a subordinate higher in a performance area than he would be ranked himself. In other cases a principal may not wish to give a high rating to a subordinate who is doing a good job out of fear of losing the assistant principal when he or she leaves to take a job promotion. Perhaps the harsher ratings are an attempt to develop the assistant principal to her/his greatest potential.

Conversely, there may be times when a principal may rank a subordinate assistant principal higher than merited in order to cover his own lack of leadership in remediating his subordinate's shortcomings. Perhaps the difference between rater groups is a reflection of the close contact the assistant principal has with the teaching staff. It is the assistant principal who implements building level policy and procedures and directly supports the work of the classroom teacher.

#### Recommendations for Practice

The results of this study point to several suggestions for principals who supervise assistant principals.

1. Items included in a district's assistant principal performance evaluation instrument should be selected with care because the evaluation instrument used to gather data should also serve as a diagnostic tool to obtain information helpful in performance improvement. When the desired behaviors are identified, the items on an evaluation instrument can be useful in directing the actions of those being evaluated.



2. As many people as possible should be involved in the evaluating process because the collective judgment of a group of raters can help offset personal bias (25). While teacher input should not be overemphasized, it is certainly useful in the evaluation process. Not only could teachers assist in identifying discriminating items for a particular district, they also could provide additional information about an assistant principal's performance to the principal who is primarily in charge with the responsibility for assistant principal evaluation. Teachers should only be asked to rate those behaviors they can observe.
3. Because a larger number of raters participated in this study, it is believed that the items identified as discriminating are representative of items which measure differences between assistant principals. Therefore, the items identified as discriminating in this study can be selected for use by local districts.
4. Performance evaluation instruments should be as short as possible while including all important assistant principal behaviors.

#### Recommendations for Further Research

Findings of this study suggest further research. In each suggested study the sample size should be as large as possible.

1. Further study should be undertaken to determine the reasons that may be causing the lower ranking of the assistant principal by the

principal rater group when compared to teacher rater group and central office/superintendent rater group.

2. The relationship between assistant principal effectiveness and ratings on the items on this instrument should be explored.
3. An investigation should be made into the possibility of developing one evaluation instrument that could be applied to all secondary administrators.
4. A series of studies should be undertaken to investigate the merits of involving teachers in the job performance evaluation of assistant principals.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Allen, Thomas F. "Identifying behaviors of the master teacher." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, 1985.
2. American Association of School Administrators. *Principles of Effective School District Governance and Administration*. (Research Report No. 021-00136), 1984.
3. Andrisek, J. R. *Administrator Performance Evaluation System*. Berea City School District, Berea, Ohio, June 1981.
4. Bacharach, Samuel B., and Mitchell, Stephen M. "The Sources of Dissatisfaction in Educational Administration: A Role-specific Analysis." *Educational Administration Quarterly* 19 (Winter 1983): 101-128.
5. Barth, Roland, and Deal, Terrence E. *The Principal: Views from Within and Without*. Paper presented at National Conference on Principals sponsored by the National Institute of Education, Washington, D.C. Monograph, the Effective Principal Research Summary, National Association of Secondary School Principals, Reston, Va., October 1982.
6. Bates, R. Clifton, and Schank, Joane G. "The Associate Principalship: A Better, More Efficient Way to Manage Schools." *NASSP Bulletin* 67, 462 (April 1983): 111-114.
7. Bolton, Dale L. *Evaluating Administrative Personnel in School Systems*. New York: Teacher College Press, 1980.
8. Bottoni, Wayne R. *How to Evaluate and Improve Principal's Performance*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National School Board Association, Houston, Texas, April 1984. (ERIC ED 247 644)
9. Brewer, James H.; Ainsworth, J. Michael; and Wynne, George E. *Kelwynn: Power Management*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1984.
10. Burch, Barbara G., and Danley, W. Elsie. "Supervisory Role Proficiency: A Self-Assessment." *NASSP Bulletin* 64 (February 1980): 91-97.
11. Burger King/NASSP. *In Honor of Excellence*. Symposium for Outstanding Teachers and Principals, Captiva Island, Florida, December 1985.

12. Cameron, William J. "Perceptions of principals, teachers, and school board members to be considered in a teacher evaluation formula based on student growth as for student characteristics and available facilitation and materials." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, 1973.
13. Carnes, Margaret L. *Evaluating Administrative Performance*. Research Report No. 219-21714. Educational Research Service, Inc., Arlington, Va., 1985.
14. Cawelti, Gordon. "Effective Instructional Leadership Produces Greater Learning." *THRUST* (Association of California School Administrators) 9 (January 1980): 8-10.
15. Chemers, Martin M., and Skrzypek, George J. "Experimental Test of the Contingency Model of Leadership Effectiveness." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 24 (November 1972): 172-177.
16. Clarke, Robert, and Gerrity, Thomas. "The Role of the Principal as Supervisor." *Education* 62 (Spring 1984): 275-277.
17. Clements, Z. J. "Enriching the Role of the Assistant Principal." *NASSP Bulletin* 64 (436) (May 1980): 14-22.
18. Croghan, John H., and Lake, Dale G. "Competencies of Effective Principals and Strategies for Implementation." *Occasional Papers in Educational Policy Analysis: Paper Number 410*. Southeastern Regional Council for Educational Improvement. Research Triangle Park, North Carolina, November 1984. (ERIC ED 251 964)
19. Croghan, John H., and Lake, Dale G. "Strategic Considerations for Improving the Principalship." *Occasional Papers in Educational Policy Analysis: Paper Number 411*. Southeastern Regional Council for Educational Improvement. Research Triangle Park, North Carolina. (ERIC ED 251 965)
20. Culbertson, Jack; Hensen, Curtis; and Morrison, Rual. *Performance Objectives for School Principals*. Berkeley: McCutchen Publishing, 1974.
21. Darnell, David F. "An analysis of the costs of administration in teacher evaluation." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, 1984.
22. Deal, Terrence E.; Dornbusch, Sanford M.; and Crawford, Robert A. "Villains as Victims: Evaluating Principals." *Phi Delta Kappan* 59 (December 1977): 273-274.
23. Demeke, Howard J. "Guidelines for Evaluating the School Principalship Seven Areas of Competence." 1971. (ERIC ED 057 479)

24. Duke, Daniel L., and Stiggins, Richard J. "Evaluating the Performance of Principals: A Descriptive Study." *Educational Administration Quarterly* 21 (Fall 1985): 71-98.
25. Educational Research Service. "Evaluating Administrative Supervisory Performance." 1971. (ERIC ED 058 155)
26. Edwards, Suzanne L. "Development and analysis of a Structured, Data Capturing Technique (SDCT) for classroom observation." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, 1985.
27. Ellett, Chad D. "Understanding and Using the Georgia Principal Assessment System." 1978. (ERIC ED 149 453)
28. Faast, Dorothy A. "An analysis of the effectiveness of training teacher evaluators in specific steps in the process of clinical supervision and teacher performance evaluation." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, 1982.
29. Frudden, Sarah H. "A comparison of school administrators' ratings of teaching performance utilizing varied instructional materials in the assessment process." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, 1980.
30. Furtwengler, Willis J. "Implementing Strategies for School Effectiveness Program." *Phi Delta Kappan* 67(4) (December 1985): 262-265.
31. Gallup Poll. "The 17th Annual Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools." *Phi Delta Kappan* 67(1) (September 1985): 35-47.
32. Garcia, Mary W. "The relationship between teachers' perception of the organizational climate and their perceptions of the effectiveness of the evaluation process." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, 1980.
33. Gaut, Robert Neal. "Teacher-Principal Assessment of Principal Performance in Selected Secondary Schools of Oklahoma." Ed.D. Dissertation. University of Oklahoma, 1969.
34. Gephart, William J.; Ingle, Robert B.; and Potter, James W. (Ed.). *The Evaluation of Administrative Performance Parameters, Problems, and Practices*. A CEDR Monograph. Phi Delta Kappa. 1975. (ERIC ED 151 907)
35. Goddu, Roland. "Observation Instruments for Identifying the Competencies of Principals in School Practice." 1977. (ERIC ED 143 627)

36. Hall, Gene; Rutherford, William L.; Hord, Shirley M.; and Huling, Leslie L. "Effects of Three Principal Styles on School Improvement." *Educational Leadership* 41 (February 1984): 22-29.
37. Harrington, Larry D. "The association of administrators learning, styles, background differences, and teacher appraisal judgments." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, 1984.
38. Hathaway, Walter E. "What Research Tells Us About the Nature of Schools That are Exceptionally Effective in Improving Student Achievement and About the Role of the Principal in Creating and Supporting Them: Notes for Discussion with Portland Oregon Public School Principals." In *Merit Pay and Evaluation* (Hot Topic Series, 1983-84, No. 2, pp. 117-144). Bloomington, Ind.: Center of Evaluation Development and Research, Phi Delta Kappa, 1981.
39. Hawley, Philip. "The Assistant Principalship Changes, Speculations Offered." *NASSP Bulletin* 69 (477) (January 1985): 88-89.
40. Henthorn, Joe. "Principal Effectiveness: A Review of Literature to Supplement 'The School Principal' and 'The School Principal: Recommendations for Effective Leadership.'" Association of California School Administrators. April 1980. (ERIC ED 210 779)
41. Hidlebaugh, Everett James. "A Model for Developing a Teacher Performance Evaluation System: A Multi-Appraisal Approach." Ph.D. Dissertation. Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, 1973.
42. Human Synergistics, Inc. *Final Report Development of an Educational Administrator Self-assessment Instrument*. Plymouth, Michigan: Author, 1983.
43. Human Synergistics, Inc. *Educational Administrator Effectiveness Profile* (EAEP). Plymouth, Mich.: Author, 1983.
44. Human Synergistics, Inc. *A Report Summarizing the Evaluation of the EAEP Instrument, Materials, Process, and Program*. Plymouth, Mich.: Author, 1985.
45. Hunt, John, and Buser, Robert L. "Evaluating the Principal-- Partnership or Paternalism?" *NASSP Bulletin* 61 (December 1977): 10-15.
46. Iannacone, George, and Podorf, Fred. "Assistant Principals: Who Are They and What Changes Can They Expect in the Positions?" *NASSP Bulletin* 68 (472) (May 1984): 116-118.

47. Irwin, Claire C. "Model Describes How Principals Can Achieve Quality Instruction." *National Association of Secondary Principals* 62 (482) (1985): 119-123.
48. "Job Descriptions for the Assistant Principal." *NASSP Bulletin* 64 (436) (May 1980): 51-55.
49. Jones, Ronald W. "A Comparison of the Critical Work Activities of School Administrators in the Iowa School Improvement Model." Unpublished Master's thesis. Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, 1985.
50. Judkins, Marvin. "Identifying discriminating items for the student evaluation of teachers." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, 1987.
51. Keefe, James W.; Kelley, Edgar A.; and Miller, Stephan K. "School Climate: Clear Definitions and a Model for a Larger Setting." *National Association of Secondary School Principals* 69 (484) (1985): 70-77.
52. Lewis, Anne C. *Evaluating Educational Personnel*. Alexandria, Va.: American Association of School Administrators, 1982.
53. Lezotte, Larry (Ed.). *The Effective School Report from Research and Practice*. (Available from Kelwynn, Inc., Grand Central Station, P.O. Box 2058, New York, N.Y. 10163). August 1985.
54. Lezotte, Lawrence W., and Bancroft, Beverly A. "Growing Use of the Effective Schools Model for School Improvement." *Educational Leadership* 42(6) (March 1985): 23-30.
55. Licata, Joseph W. *Systematic Appraisal, Effective School*. Reston, Va.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1981.
56. Licklider, Barbara L. Davis. "Examination of a site-based, peer coaching inservice model." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, 1986.
57. Lipham, James A. *Effective Principal, Effective School*. Reston, Va.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1981.
58. Look, Ellen E. "Selecting criteria for evaluation of school principals based upon item discrimination power and job situation." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, 1983.
59. Look, Ellen, and Manatt, Richard P. *Performance Criteria for the Evaluation of School Principals and Headmasters*. Occasional Paper 83-4. The School Improvement Model Project, College of Education, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, June 1983.

60. Ludwig, Ann E. "An Analytical Survey of Principal Evaluation in Large Secondary Public School Districts in Cook County, Illinois." Ed.D. Dissertation. Loyola University, Chicago, Ill., 1980.
61. Lueders, Wayne J. "Selecting performance criteria for the evaluation of public school superintendents based on item discrimination power." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, 1987.
62. Manatt, Richard P.; Look, Ellen E.; and Netusil, Anton J. *Administrator Performance Evaluation*. (Field Test Document). Watertown Unified School District, Watertown, Wisconsin, Fall 1985.
63. Manatt, Richard P., and Stow, Shirley B. *Clinical Manual for Teacher Performance Evaluation*. Iowa State University Research Foundation, Inc., Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, November 1984.
64. McCleary, Lloyd. "Evaluation of Principals." *Theory into Practice* 1 (February 1979): 45-49.
65. McCleary, Lloyd. "Toward a Reconstruction of the Principalship." *The Executive Review* 2 (December 1981): 197-205.
66. McDonald, Milton, S., and others. "Administrator Evaluation: A Look at Georgia and the Nation." 1979. (ERIC ED 180 106)
67. McIntyre, Kenneth E. "Administering and Improving the Educational Program." In Jack Culbertson, Curtiss Henson, and Ruel Morrison, Eds. *Performance Objectives for School Principals*, pp. 152-169. Berkeley, Ca.: McCutchen Publishing, 1974.
68. Menne, John W. "Teacher Evaluation: Performance or Effectiveness?" Mimeographed paper on file in Test and Evaluation Center, Carver Hall, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, 1972.
69. Menne, John W., and Tolsma, Robert J. "A Discrimination Index for Items in Instruments Using Group Responses." *Journal of Educational Measurement* 8 (Spring 1971): 5-7.
70. Miskel, Cecil G. "Principals' Perceived Effectiveness, Innovation Effort, and the School Situation." *Educational Administration Quarterly* 13 (Winter 1977): 31-46.
71. Mitchell, Jacqueline K. "Improvement-directed analysis of marginal teachers." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, 1985.
72. Mitchell, Mack. "Assistant Principals Can Be Effective Counselors, Mediators." *NASSP Bulletin* 64 (436) (May 1980): 29-32.



73. Mueller, Donald W. "Development of performance improvement commitments for secondary school principals." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, 1987.
74. Nance, Steven R. "Training school administrators in the writing of quality professional improvement commitments." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, 1986.
75. Nicholson, Everett W. "The Performance of Principals in the Accountability Syndrom." 1972. (ERIC ED 063 626)
76. Noriega, Florentino G. *Evaluation of Secondary School Principals (Grades 7-12)*. Occasional Paper 85-7. The School Improvement Model Project, College of Education, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, September 1985.
77. Noriega, Florentino G. "The high gain teacher." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, 1987.
78. Ohio Association of Elementary School Principals. "Evaluation of Administrators: Guidelines and Procedures." 1971. (ERIC ED 105 580)
79. Persell, Caroline H., and Cookson, Peter W., Jr. *The Effective Principal in Action*. Paper presented at the National Conference on Principals sponsored by the National Institute of Education, Washington, D.C. Monograph, *The Effective Principal: A Research Summary*, National Association of Secondary School Principals, Reston, Va., October 1982.
80. Pharis, William L. "The Evaluation of School Principals." *The National Elementary Principal* 52 (February 1973): 36-38.
81. Phi Delta Kappa Project Staff for the Study of Exceptional Urban Elementary Schools. *Why Do Some Urban Schools Succeed?* Bloomington, Ind.: Phi Delta Kappa, 1980.
82. Pinckney, Robert D. "An Analysis of School Building Administrative Functions, Building Administrator Effectiveness, and Measures of School Effectiveness." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, 1982.
83. Potter, James M., Jr. "Enhancing the Role of the Assistant Principal." *NASSP Bulletin* 64 (436) (May 1980): 9-13.
84. Rauhauser, William D. "An Analysis of the Quality and Effectiveness of Teachers' Job Improvement Targets." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, 1983.
85. Redfern, George B. "Principals: Who's Evaluating Them, Why and How?" *NASSP Bulletin* 56 (May 1972): 85-93.

86. Redfern, George B., and Hersey, Paul W. "Evaluation of Principals: Leadership Excellence Achievement Plan." *The Practitioner* 3(4) (June 1981): 1-12.
87. Results Oriented Management in Education: Project R.O.M.E. "The Verification and Validation of Principal Competencies and Performance Indicators: Assessment Design--Procedures--Instrumentation--Field Test Results." 1975. (ERIC ED 123 789)
88. Rice, Ronald M. "Effectiveness of a systematic, media facilitated approach to training school administrators to conquer postobservation conferences." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, 1986.
89. Robinson, Glen E. "Effective Schools Research: A Guide to School Improvement." Educational Research Service, Inc., Arlington, Va., February 1985.
90. Rosenberg, Max. "How Does Your Principal Rate?" *Teacher* 91 (May 1974): 25-27.
91. Rosenberg, Max. "The Values of School Principal Evaluation." *Education* 91 (Fall 1971): 212-214.
92. Rucker, Dennis. "A study of principals' teaching style preference and teachers' teaching style as a source of bias in teacher evaluation." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, 1981.
93. Saif, Philip S. "A Handbook for the Evaluation of Classroom Teachers and School Principals." 1976. (ERIC ED 33 371)
94. Sanacore, Joseph. "How Teachers Can Evaluate Their Principal." *NASSP Bulletin* 60 (October 1976): 98-101.
95. Sapone, Carmelo V. "An Appraisal and Evaluation System for Teachers and Administrators." *Educational Technology* 20 (May 1980): 44-49.
96. Schycker, Nancy K. "Creation and testing of a prescriptive-diagnostic staff development instrument for K-12 teachers." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, 1983.
97. Seal, Edgar Z. "Development, Implementation, and Evaluation of a Model Program for Evaluating School Principals." 1977. (ERIC ED 156 679)
98. Semones, Marilyn M. "The development and feasibility of a data gathering instrument." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, 1987.

99. Spencer, Karen M. "Post observation conferences: Factors related to success." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, 1985.
100. Stevenson, Lynn. "Teacher performance evaluation as structured within a knowledge-based system: A question of feasibility." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, 1987.
101. Stow, Shirley B. *Targets: The "Centerpiece" of an Evaluation Process*. The School Model Improvement Project, College of Education, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, 1985.
102. Stow, Shirley B., and Manatt, Richard P. "Developing an Administrator Performance Evaluation System Tailored to the Needs of Your District." *Educational Leadership* 39 (exp. February 1982): 346-348.
103. Stow, Shirley B.; Manatt, Richard P.; Mitchell, Jacqueline; and Hawana, Walid. *A Compendium of Validated Professional Improvement Commitments*. Iowa State University Research Foundation, Inc., Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, November 1984.
104. Sweeney, James. *Building a Climate for Excellence*. Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, 1985.
105. Sweeney, James. "Principals Do Make a Difference--A Report on School Effectiveness." *Educational Leadership* 39 (exp. February 1982): 349-352.
106. Tyron, Gaylord. "Role Perceptions of the Elementary School Principal as Perceived by Superintendents, Board Presidents, Secondary Principals, Elementary Teachers, and Elementary Principals." Ph.D. Dissertation. Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, 1978.
107. Uhl, Perry L. "Selecting criteria for the evaluation of school counselors based on item discrimination power." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, 1988.
108. Walters, Donald L. "The Measurement of Administrative Competencies." *Phi Delta Kappan* 61 (February 1980): 423-425.
109. Walters, Donald L. "Perceptions of Administrative Competencies: A Survey of School Principals and Superintendents." 1979. (ERIC ED 172 361)
110. Weber, George. *Inner-City Children Can Be Taught to Read: Four Successful Schools*. CBE Occasional Papers, No. 18. Washington, D.C.: Council for Basic Education. 1971. (ERIC ED 057 125)

111. Westerberg, Timothy R. "The effects of classroom observation by principals on conference climate and classroom performance of teachers." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, 1983.
112. Wuhs, Susan. "State Requirements for Teacher and Administrator Performance Evaluation 1982." Masters Creative Component. Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, 1982.
113. Zakrajsek, Barbra. "Evaluation Systems: A Critical Look." *NASSP Bulletin* 63 (January 1979): 100-111.
114. Zechman, Harry T. "Are Principals Competent in the Instructional Leadership Domain?" *NASSP Bulletin* 61 (December 1977): 21-25.
115. Zukl, Gary. *Managerial Leadership and the Effective Principal*. Paper presented at the National Conference on Principals sponsored by the National Institute of Education, Washington, D.C. Monograph, The Effective Principal: A Research Summary, National Association of Secondary School Principals, Reston, Va., October 1982.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I want to thank Dr. Manatt, my major advisor on this study. His patience, guidance, and encouragement kept me on task and have been instrumental in bringing this project to a successful conclusion.

I also owe debts of gratitude to Dr. Netusil, Dr. Stowe, Dr. Wolansky, and Dr. Hvistendahl. Their suggestions, advice, and wise counsel contributed a great deal to this study.

Thanks also need to be given to my wife, Carmen, and our children, Jackie, Bob, and Stephen, for their unwavering confidence and support while this study was in progress.

**APPENDIX**

ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL PERFORMANCE  
ITEM DISCRIMINATION QUESTIONNAIRE

INTRODUCTION

A research team at Iowa State University, headed by Professor Richard Manatt, has worked for nearly 20 years developing discriminating performance evaluation items to be used with educational professionals. The team has established a very useful list of discriminating items for teachers, principals, and superintendents. Now Dr. Manatt and researcher Richard Edwards asks for your help in developing similar items for assistant principals. Better evaluation systems for assistant principals will make better assistant principals; men and women who are more capable of performing the important job of leading and directing our schools.

Representatives from selected schools working on school improvement models plus several individual assistant principals who have volunteered are participating in this study. By completing this questionnaire you can play a very prominent role in the development of an improved instrument to be used in assistant principal performance evaluation. Your responses to this survey will be carefully analyzed and the items which discriminate among assistant principals will be identified. These items can then be used to build improved evaluation instruments or to refine currently used instruments to provide a more accurate assessment of assistant principal performance. This questionnaire is not intended to access the relative value of each item or to specifically evaluate an assistant principal's performance.

Each assistant principal being rated in this project receives a confidential report of the means of his/her ratings and the means for the total group of assistant principals rated. No one else receives this information.

Responses are treated confidentially and every precaution is taken to prevent disclosure of individual ratings. Your submission of a completed answer sheet will be construed as a modified consent to participate.

If you choose not to participate, please place the answer sheet unmarked in the envelope provided, seal it, and return it to the designated building secretary.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION IN THIS RESEARCH

- You do not need to  
fill in the circles  
under the letters.

<u>Definition of Rating</u>	<u>Rating</u>
Never or strongly disagree.....	1
Seldom or disagree.....	2
Sometimes or neither agree nor disagree.....	3
Often or agree.....	4
Always or strongly agree.....	5
Unable to observe.....	No Response
(No mark is entered)	

The assistant principal schedules meetings with staff to discuss responsibilities, assignments, or changes.



ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL PERFORMANCE  
ITEM DISCRIMINATION QUESTIONNAIRE

FOR EACH QUESTION, PLEASE MARK THE NUMBER ON YOUR ANSWER SHEET WHICH MOST ACCURATELY DESCRIBES YOUR JUDGMENT OF THE DESIGNATED ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL PERFORMANCE ON THE ITEM BEING RATED. MARK ONLY ONE RESPONSE PER ITEM. USE A #2 PENCIL.

EXPLANATION OF RATING SCALE

Never or strongly disagree	1
Seldom or disagree	2
Sometimes or neither agree nor disagree	3
Often or agree	4
Always or strongly agree	5
Unable to observe	NO RESPONSE (NO MARK IS ENTERED)

EXAMPLE:

- |   |           |
|---|-----------|
| 1. The assistant principal provides materials and resources necessary for the instructional program.                                  | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| <hr/>   |           |
| 1. The assistant principal provides materials and resources necessary for the instructional program.                                  | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 2. The assistant principal uses evaluation findings to make decisions to expand, revise, or suspend programs.                         | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 3. The assistant principal organizes a system in which teachers work cooperatively to develop and implement instructional objectives. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 4. The assistant principal regularly inspects plant facilities to check conditions and corrects unsafe or unsatisfactory conditions.  | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 5. The assistant principal interprets school policies and procedures to parents and informs them of changes that occur.               | 1 2 3 4 5 |

- |  |   |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6. The assistant principal schedules meetings with staff to discuss responsibilities, assignments, or changes.   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. The assistant principal takes a strong interest in teachers' professional development.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. The assistant principal provides parents with regular reports of their child's progress and encourages them to confer frequently with staff members.        | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. The assistant principal keeps students informed of the school's goals, policies, and activities.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10. The assistant principal maintains a well-organized comprehensive and continuous student testing program.   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11. The assistant principal promotes activities to identify, analyze, and solve instructional problems.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. The assistant principal encourages a free and open flow of comments, suggestions, and recommendations from staff.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13. The assistant principal schedules instructional space for maximum utilization and strives for minimum disruption of instruction.                           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14. The assistant principal provides supervisory assistance at student activities.   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 15. The assistant principal makes regular, systematic, and cooperative appraisals of each staff member's performance, always including a follow-up conference. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 16. The assistant principal assigns responsibilities and duties equitably and bases assignments on the skills and capabilities of staff members.               | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 17. The assistant principal asks for teacher input concerning the changing needs for time and space for various instructional purposes.                        | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 18. The assistant principal keeps the community well-informed concerning school's activities, needs, and opportunities.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

- |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 19. The assistant principal demonstrates knowledge of the teaching/learning process and gives information or provides assistance from others. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 20. The assistant principal defines goals and objectives of the school and works toward articulation between schools and grades.              | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 21. The assistant principal collects, organizes, and interprets data concerning other than teacher influences on learning.                    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 22. The assistant principal recognizes and supports differences in teachers and teaching styles.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 23. The assistant principal discusses duties and responsibilities with teachers before assignment and on a continuous basis.                  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 24. The assistant principal protects staff from unreasonable demands by parents and/or community members.                                     | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 25. The assistant principal encourages teachers to use community resources and enlists community support for school projects.                 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 26. The assistant principal provides support and direction for those staff members seeking to improve their skills.                           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 27. The assistant principal supervises student record keeping and handling of official forms and documents.                                   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 28. The assistant principal informs staff of school policies and procedures.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 29. The assistant principal encourages teachers to try innovative ideas and keeps staff informed of the latest educational developments.      | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 30. The assistant principal provides a variety of instructional programs to meet individual learner needs.                                    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

- |  |   |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 31. The assistant principal provides procedures for the security of school facilities and safety for all personnel.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 32. The assistant principal emphasizes student achievement with teachers and students on a regular basis.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 33. The assistant principal provides positive reinforcement to teachers for their efforts and accomplishments--formally and informally.                                    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 34. The assistant principal provides for organizing, collecting, and analyzing data to be used to identify curriculum needs (changes in scope, sequence, materials, etc.). | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 35. The assistant principal sets high standards of conduct and monitors all facets of school life to insure that these standards are met.                                  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 36. The assistant principal monitors the curriculum and identifies progress toward stated curriculum/program goals.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 37. The assistant principal supervises student transportation.   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 38. The assistant principal stimulates interest in the school by scheduling and/or attending programs and activities.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 39. The assistant principal evaluates instructional techniques.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 40. The assistant principal assists teachers to establish effective relationships with individual students.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 41. The assistant principal maintains high standards for cleanliness, lighting, heating, ventilation, sanitation, and comfort.   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 42. The assistant principal involves representative students in the work of important school activities.   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 43. The assistant principal coordinates and/or attends staffing conferences to assess a learner's needs.   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

- |  |   |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 44. The assistant principal helps teachers devise individual instructional goals.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 45. The assistant principal discusses student problems or progress with teachers regularly.                              | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 46. The assistant principal organizes the faculty to evaluate curriculum on a continuous basis.                          | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 47. The assistant principal has high expectations for student academic achievement.                                      | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 48. The assistant principal works with problem students in designing the appropriate behavior measures for all students. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 49. The assistant principal coordinates the budget developing process.   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 50. The assistant principal develops inservice programs for the staff.   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Appraiser FormASSISTANT PRINCIPAL PERFORMANCE  
ITEM DISCRIMINATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Name of Assistant Principal \_\_\_\_\_

The following employees have been given an assistant principal performance questionnaire:

Name of Employee	(✓) Check when envelope returned
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	
6.	
7.	
8.	
9.	
10.	
11.	
12.	
13.	
14.	
15.	
16.	
17.	
18.	
19.	
20.	

USE OF HUMAN SUBJECTS FOR THE DISSERTATION  
RESEARCH OF RICHARD R. EDWARDS  
(February 1988)

Under the direction of Richard Manatt, as part of an ongoing development series of performance appraisal instruments by the School Improvement Model researchers (in the Research Institute for Studies in Education), a new instrument for the appraisal of secondary assistant principals is being developed.

The creation of a pool of performance criteria will be selected from evaluation instruments, job descriptions, administrative skill performance criterion listings, and competency-based guidance models for validity and tested for discrimination power and reliability.

The methodological steps include:

1. Obtaining the cooperation of selected schools working on school improvement models plus several individual assistant principals who have volunteered.
2. Selecting appropriate assistant principals for the research.
3. Identifying at least 15 knowledgeable subjects to rate the selected assistant principals on each of the 45 potential criteria.
4. Analyzing the data using the Menne-Tolsma formula for determining performance items which have discriminative power. The Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient will be calculated on all items identified as discriminating at the .05 level of significance to provide an estimate of internal consistency.
5. A model assistant principal evaluation instrument will then be developed using the items which have been determined to be discriminating.

The following procedures will be used for distributing and collecting the assistant principal performance item discrimination questionnaire to assure confidentiality for those participating in the study.

1. The building principal of a participating school is sent a packet of at least 15 sealed envelopes, an Appraiser Form for each assistant principal in his/her school taking part in the study, and a return envelope.
2. Each of the envelopes has one of the following positions printed in the upper right-hand corner:  
Building Principal  
Central Office Administrator  
Assistant Principal (Self-evaluating)  
Teacher
3. The building principal gives the packet of materials to the assistant principal to be rated whose name appears in the upper left-hand corner of the envelope. The assistant principal personally distributes each envelope to a school employee holding a position designated in the upper right-hand corner.

4. The assistant principal writes the names of the people he/she distributes the envelopes to on the Appraiser Form and gives this list to a designated secretary. The name of the assistant principal being rated appears in bold print at the top of this form.
5. Each envelope contains:
  - A. An answer sheet with the name of the assistant principal printed at the top.
  - B. A questionnaire with the appropriate instructions for completing it. (Each person completing a questionnaire is asked to print their current position title: "PRINCIPAL" "CENTRAL OFFICE ADMINISTRATOR" "ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL" or "TEACHER" in the blank spaces under the title "NAME" in the upper left-hand corner of the answer sheet. Also, each person is to complete the box titled "SEX.")
  - C. An envelope for returning the answer sheet to the designated secretary.
6. Because this is a human subjects research study each person completing the questionnaire has the right to choose not to participate. To protect the identity of a person making this choice he/she is instructed to place the answer sheet unmarked in the envelope provided, seal it, and return it to the designated building secretary whose name appears in the upper left-hand corner.
7. Those who complete an answer sheet are asked to seal it in the envelope provided and return it to the designated building secretary whose name appears in the upper left-hand corner. The submission of a completed answer sheet will be construed as a modified consent to participate.
8. The designated building secretary checks off the names of the Appraiser Form as the sealed envelopes are returned. The secretary forwards the envelopes to Professor Manatt at Iowa State University for processing.
9. Responses are treated confidentially and every precaution is taken to prevent disclosure of individual responses.
10. When the envelopes are received at the processing center they are opened by the researcher and the name of the assistant principal at the top of each sheet is removed and replaced with a number in order to assure additional anonymity during processing.
11. Each assistant principal being evaluated in this project receives a confidential report of the means of his/her ratings and the means for the total group of assistant principals rated.

For this study, at least 30 assistant principals will be evaluated by a minimum of 15 raters each.



**INFORMATION ON THE USE OF HUMAN SUBJECTS IN RESEARCH**

**IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY**

(Please follow the accompanying Instructions for completing this form.)

81

1. Title of project (please type): Selecting Criteria for the Evaluation of Secondary School Assistant Principals Based Upon Item Discrimination Power

2. I agree to provide the proper surveillance of this project to insure that the rights and welfare of the human subjects are properly protected. Additions to or changes in procedures affecting the subjects after the project has been approved will be submitted to the committee for review.

Richard R. Edwards

2/10/88

*Richard R. Edwards*  
Signature of Principal Investigator

Typed Name of Principal Investigator

Date

1473 E. 27th Street

602-726-1474

Yuma, Arizona

Campus Address

Campus Telephone

3. Signatures of others (if any)      Date      Relationship to Principal Investigator  
*Richard R. Edwards*      2-14-88      Principal Investigator

4. ATTACH an additional page(s) (A) describing your proposed research and (B) the subjects to be used, (C) indicating any risks or discomforts to the subjects, and (D) covering any topics checked below. CHECK all boxes applicable.

- ☐ Medical clearance necessary before subjects can participate
- ☐ Samples (blood, tissue, etc.) from subjects
- ☐ Administration of substances (foods, drugs, etc.) to subjects
- ☐ Physical exercise or conditioning for subjects
- ☐ Deception of subjects
- ☐ Subjects under 14 years of age and(or)      ☐ Subjects 14-17 years of age
- ☐ Subjects in Institutions
- ☐ Research must be approved by another Institution or agency



5. ATTACH an example of the material to be used to obtain informed consent and CHECK which type will be used.

- ☐ Signed informed consent will be obtained.
- ☒ Modified informed consent will be obtained.

6. Anticipated date on which subjects will be first contacted:      Month      Day      Year  
   March      1      1988

Anticipated date for last contact with subjects:      April      15      1988

7. If Applicable: Anticipated date on which audio or visual tapes will be erased and(or) Identifiers will be removed from completed survey instruments:

8. Signature of Head or Chairperson      Date      Department or Administrative Unit  
*George G. Karas*      2/11/88      Prov. Studies

9. Decision of the University Committee on the Use of Human Subjects in Research:

- ☒ Project Approved      ☐ Project not approved      ☐ No action required

George G. Karas

3/2/88

act...